PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)
USYS-0148/03-043		
International application No.	International filing date *(day/month/year)*	Priority date *(day/month/year)*
PCT/US04/08498	19 March 2004 (19.03.2004)	19 March 2003 (19.03.2003)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC		
IPC(7): G06F 17/30 and US Cl.: 707/10, 100, 101, 104.1; 345/700		
Applicant		
UNISYS CORPORATION		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

   ☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

   These annexes consist of a total of 0 sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

   - I ☒ Basis of the report
   - II ☐ Priority
   - III ☐ Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
   - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
   - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
   - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
   - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
   - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion of this report
12 October 2004 (12.10.2004)	21 January 2005 (21.01.2005)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Fred I. Ehichioya Telephone No. 571-272-4034

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US04/08498

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed.

☒ the description:
pages 1 - 31 as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the claims:
pages 32 - 35 , as originally filed
pages NONE , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the drawings:
pages 1 - 20 , as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____.

☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE , as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language English which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☒ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination(under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages NONE

☐ the claims, Nos. NONE

☐ the drawings, sheets/~~fig~~ NONE

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

** Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).*

*** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.*

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US04/08498

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims 4-15, 20-31	YES
	Claims 1-3, 16-19, 32	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1 - 32	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims 1-32	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS
Please See Continuation Sheet

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US04/08498

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claim 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 32 do not meet novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent U.S. Patent 6,668,254 issued to Ken Matson et al ("Matson").

Regarding claims 1 and 17, Matson teaches a method for use in consolidating computing devices, comprising:
storing in at least two data set files containing information indicative of the characteristics of at least a first computing device wherein the data sets describe the information in a markup language (Fig.2 and column 5, lines 48 - 58);
loading the at least two data sets into a first relational database so that the at least two data sets can be compared to each other (column 2, lines 5 - 10).

Regarding claims 2 and 18, Matson teaches wherein one of the at least two data sets contains information indicative of a second computing device (column 6, lines 10 - 21 and column 7, lines 35 - 41).

Regarding claims 3 and 19, Matson teaches wherein the markup language comprises XML (column 5, lines 16 - 26).

Regarding claims 16 and 32, Matson teaches a second table related to the database name table wherein the second table is a table comprising at least one of: trigger, procedure, database role, function, and procedure (column 7, lines 27 - 30).

Claims 4 - 14 and 20 - 30 do not meet an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Matson in view of U.S. Pub. Number 2002/0059259 issued to Curt Lee Cotner et al ("Cotner").

Regarding claims 4 and 20, Matson does not explicitly teach wherein the information indicative of the characteristics of a computing device comprises information indicative of system parameters.

Cotner teaches wherein the information indicative of the characteristics of a computing device comprises information indicative of system parameters (page 2, [0025]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cotner with Matson wherein the parameters enable the customization of the stored procedures. The store procedures comprise pre-defined functions that access the user and system tables.

Regarding claims 5 and 21, Cotner teaches wherein the system parameters comprise at least one of: the number of processors, available processors, processor level, devices, disk drive characteristics, disk drive capacity, system name, page size, operating system version, operating system build, and network connectivity (page 2, [0019]).

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US04/08498

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Regarding claims 6 and 22, Cotner teaches wherein the information indicative of the characteristics of a computing device comprises information indicative of executable process parameters (page 2, [0025]).

Regarding claims 7 and 23, Cotner teaches the executable process parameters comprise at least one of: CPU utilization, memory utilization, active processes, active process dependencies, processor usage, memory usage, process creation time, process 1D, process owner, process handles, process version, dependency version, process timestamp, process description, and dependency description (page 1, [0008] and [0014]).

Regarding claims 8 and 24, Cotner teaches the first relational database comprises a system information table for maintaining the system information for at least one computing device (page 3, [0041]).

Regarding claims 9 and 25, Cotner teaches the first relational database comprises a process table related to the system information table, wherein the process table maintains information related to executable processes on a computing device (page 3, [0041]).

Regarding claims 10 and 26, Cotner teaches the first relational database comprises a module table related to the system information table, wherein the module table maintains information related to modules on a computing device that are used by a process (page 2, [0016]).

Regarding claims 11 and 27, Cotner teaches the information indicative of the characteristics of a computing device comprises information indicative of computing device database definition parameters (page 2, [0022]).

Regarding claims 12 and 28, Cotner teaches the computing device database definition parameters comprise at least one of: database names, roles, users, aliases, defaults, rules, functions, user defined datatypes, user messages, tables, views, indexes, extended procedures, stored procedures, and triggers (page 2, [0024] - [0025]).

Regarding claims 13 and 29, Cotner teaches the first relational database comprises a database name table for maintaining the names of computing device database names (page 3, [0041]).

Regarding claims 14 and 30, Cotner teaches the first relational database comprises a table table related to the database name table, wherein the table table maintains computing device database table names (page 3, [0041]).

Claims 15 and 31 do not meet an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Matson in view of U.S. Pub. Number 2003/0030656 issued to Darwin Ang et al ("Ang").

Regarding claims 15 and 31, Matson does not explicitly teach the first relational database comprises a column table related to the table table, wherein the column table maintains computing device database column names.
Ang teaches the first relational database comprises a column table related to the table table, wherein the column table maintains computing device database column names (page 4, [0041] and page 6, [0060]).
It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ang with Matson to achieve the overall structure a of table that is suited for viewing in a portable computing device.

---------- NEW CITATIONS ----------